

in their own States. They have brought us good ideas from their States that we have incorporated in S. 942.

I share the sentiments expressed by Senator BURNS. We have had great cooperation, as mentioned before, from Senator BUMPERS, all of the Democratic members of the Small Business Committee, and their staffs. I think we have a good piece of legislation. Senator COVERDELL, at my request, introduced a letter of endorsement from the National Association of Towns and Townships. They, too, are going to be affected and benefited. This is not for small profitmaking corporations only or individuals; this affects small entities like not for profits and small local units of government.

So we have made an offer for a very tight unanimous consent request to move forward on this bill. We asked to do it today. That was objected to. We asked to do it Tuesday. That was objected to.

My plea is, small business, small entities want some relief. They have given us good ideas. We worked on it in the committee. Let us go forward. I ask the Members on the other side who are objecting, let us go forward and get on with this, because small business deserves to have an answer. So do the other small entities affected. I hope that we will be able to move forward early next week. But right now it still depends upon whether the objections will be raised on the other side.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I thank the Chair.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

#### THE OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I hope that my distinguished friend from Missouri and my friend from Montana will attend my remarks for just a moment, and perhaps comment on them, just as they have on one another's with respect to the bill that they have been so eloquently attempting to move to passage.

Just a few moments ago, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator HATFIELD, appeared on the floor with the extraordinary news that the administration had expressed its unwavering intention to veto the omnibus appropriations bill that was reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee just yesterday.

The Senator from Oregon pointed out that appropriations, the spending authorization for the spending of money, is the prerogative of Congress. That is perhaps the most fundamental of all the prerogatives of Congress, that no President of the United States has ever been able to or can now or will be able to in the future force the Congress to pass an appropriation at a level that the President wishes.

But my distinguished chairman and friend from Oregon, I do not think,

reached the true depths of the arrogance of this veto threat. So while he was speaking, I got out our publication, our committee report, on the subject. I discovered that the total amount of money that we proposed to allow the President of the United States to spend during the current fiscal year in that bill, for five different agencies, is \$164 billion, approximately \$164 billion, approximately \$164 billion, of which a little less than \$5 billion is restricted and cannot be spent unless the President reaches an agreement with Congress on a balanced budget at some time in the future.

The President of the United States has said that he will veto this bill unless we allow him to spend \$166 billion instead of \$164 billion without any restrictions, without any commitment on his part, without any agreement with the Congress with respect to a balanced budget in the future.

I must say that I find this to be absolutely extraordinary and without precedent, that a President of the United States should, once again, threaten to close down five major units of our Government because we propose to allow him to spend \$164 billion and he wants to spend \$166 billion.

I know that each of my colleagues here on the floor is a chairman of a subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee, as am I. The Senator from Missouri and I are chairmen of subcommittees whose bills are a part of this overall bill. But I just wonder whether they agree with me or not that it is practically beyond belief that a President of the United States should threaten this whole range of programs in all of our areas on which we are willing to spend \$164 billion just as he is willing to commit himself at some point or another to a balanced budget, and the great bulk of that, \$159 billion anyway, whether he agrees or not, just because we will not spend \$2 billion more than he wants.

Mr. BURNS. If the Senator from Washington will yield.

Mr. GORTON. I will yield.

Mr. BURNS. I do not know where he wants to spend the \$2 billion. He was not specific about that, I ask?

Mr. GORTON. I believe he was specific about it. Perhaps a few hundred million were in the field of the Senator from Missouri. Others were in social and health services.

My own responsibility for the Department of Interior and related agencies, where we are willing to spend \$12.5 billion, is maybe \$200 million more than he wants to spend over and above \$12.5 billion; in other words, 1 or 2 percent more money than we are authorizing for him, and yet he threatens to veto this entire bill because he cannot spend every dime that he wishes to spend.

Mr. BURNS. I congratulate the Senator from Washington, because I know we had to look at Indian schools, we had to look at the Indian Health Service. Those areas suffered cuts last year,

and we tried to add some money back and were successful in doing that, and we get this close.

I am wondering, though, if we are not sort of lapping over into the political world rather than the world of reality or this world of trying to finance the Government and make it work.

Mr. GORTON. It seems to me that is the most apt comment on the subject.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield.

Mr. GORTON. He will.

Mr. BOND. The thing that is striking to me is that we have been working on these bills for many months. I have been working on the title which funds veterans, housing, environment, Federal emergency management, and as I think my distinguished colleague knows, we have been trying to find out from the administration what they want.

I remember when our son was 2 or 3 years old, he would come in and say he wants more. From a 2- or 3-year-old maybe more is a reasonable request, but when you get it from a Budget Director who is supposedly supporting a President who now recognizes the need for a balanced budget, when the President and the Budget Director refuse to give you any specifics, it, to me, is amazing that they can get by with doing nothing but issuing veto threats.

I ask the Senator, maybe he has heard, because I have not heard, from the White House, the Office of Management and Budget, of any changes that they wish to see so that they can utilize the funds better?

It is a great gimmick. It is a great political campaign to say, "I am going to spend more on everything. Of course, I'm for a balanced budget. Of course, I'm for a balanced budget, but I want to spend more on everything."

Do they tell you where they want to make any cuts, I ask the Senator? Did they tell you where they want to save money?

Mr. GORTON. For almost a year, this Senator has suggested that within the frame of reference of the amount of money available to use for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, if the administration wanted to shift priorities, then we would be happy, seriously, to consider those shifts. None have been proposed.

Mr. BOND. You have not heard from them either. I thought I was the only one who was completely stiffed by them. In November, I put in requests. I asked the Agency heads, the Department heads whose budgets we fund, "If there is an adult in supervisory authority, please have them contact us and say what changes they want to make."

I had a conversation with the Vice President. I said, "This is a process in which the executive and the legislative branches need to sit down and compromise."

Every government I have ever served in, and I served at the State level where I was a Republican chief executive with a Democratically controlled

legislature, we always sat down and worked together, and the people expected us to do that.

How can the people of the United States expect us to negotiate a budget or appropriations bills when one side will not even talk to us and all they do is send veto threats? I ask my colleague, how do you compromise? How do you work with, how do you negotiate with somebody who will not talk with you?

Mr. GORTON. Well, you do not. I must say, I found particularly striking the analogy of the Senator from Missouri to a 2- or 3-year-old child who simply says, "More."

In this case, what we have is an administration that only says, "More. We want more spending, we do not want any setoffs, but we want to send the bill to somebody else, to our children and our grandchildren. We really do not want a serious proposal that will lead us to a balanced budget, except maybe after the end of the next Presidential term. We will think about binding someone in the future, but we don't want to bind ourselves."

So we have now in front of us the proposition that \$164 billion is not enough money to spend, and the President will veto a bill that only spends \$164 billion, of which \$5 billion is fenced, as it were. "We've got to have \$166 billion to spend the way we want without any conditions imposed on that spending."

Again, I think the Senator from Oregon was too polite to say so, but I believe that if that is the proposition with which we are faced, it is pointless to spend a week or so of this body's time debating the details of a proposal which will be vetoed in any event.

Regrettably, we will perhaps have to approach the President with another of these notorious continuing resolutions; that is to say, short-term appropriations bills, which—and I think I can speak for my colleagues on this side of the aisle—when I say they will be for smaller amounts of money, they will be markedly smaller amounts of money in authorizations for the administration than is the bill that was arrived at working with both Republicans and Democrats in an attempt to reach a common ground somewhere between the last set of appropriations proposed by this body and those originally asked for by the President.

It is too bad, but here we are with a veto threat over the proposition that we are not going to spend \$166 billion in exactly the way the President wishes but only \$164 billion, with \$5 billion of it contingent upon the President agreeing to a balanced budget at some reasonable future time.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

#### STATEMENTS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON ARE RELEVANT TODAY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I recently came upon some statements of-

fered by Thomas Jefferson, which, I think, appear to bear some remarkable relevance to our current predicament. To quote from one of them from 1816, in a letter to Governor Plumer, he said: "I place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared."

On another occasion, he made the same point, perhaps even more dramatically, in a letter to Samuel Kerchival, also in 1816: "We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude."

It is when we are having the most difficulty attending to and resolving the most vexing issues of the day that we can profit most from such reminders and that much of what confronts us today has been dealt with by so many of our greatest public servants who came before us.

One simply cannot read many of the statements of our third President, Thomas Jefferson, without coming upon repeated, potent references to the necessity of eliminating public debt. I suggest that he would be horrified to learn that we would ever consider allowing our current impasse to stand and to leave deficits and mandatory spending to spiral upward unabated.

It is all very well, politically, to say that we will—our two parties—take our respective cases to the electorate in November to "let the people decide" as to who failed who in the realm of public responsibility. But, in the meantime, I think we do a tremendous disservice to our citizens for as long as we leave this situation unresolved.

Here is another quote from Thomas Jefferson, stated to Thomas Cooper in 1802, which says it perhaps more vividly and relevantly even than the others: "If we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy."

Well, I think that is the nub of it. "If we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy."

I certainly agree with that. I can think of few things more dangerous and more cruelly deceptive than to suggest that we must continue to pile debt and misery upon our children's heads because we dare not slow down, in any way, the current engines of spending growth, which churn out funding for various beneficiaries of Government largess. We do not "take care of" anybody when we do this. We do not take care of anyone's children by forcing tomorrow's children to pay lifetime tax rates of 80 percent. That will, I assure my colleagues, lead to more misery, more poverty, more hunger and need and deprivation, and more intergenerational hostility than anything ever contemplated in any balanced budget agreement.

Mr. Jefferson was fully acquainted with the dangers of mounting public debt. Indeed, one might say that the

principal challenge of the young republic was how to discharge the massive debts compiled by the individual States in the course of the American Revolution.

Alexander Hamilton was, of course, instrumental in diagnosing the severity and nationality of this problem, arguing that the Federal Government must bear the burden of lifting the national debt burden because we would all collapse together anyway if this was not properly done.

That brings to mind Daniel Webster's remark about Alexander Hamilton. If you think of rhetoric today and the emotion and passion of speech, Webster said this about Hamilton: "He smote the rock of the national resources, and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth. He touched the dead corpse of Public Credit, and it sprung upon his feet." Now, you can see that quote etched at the base of the Hamilton statue at the Department of the Treasury, if you so desire to check it.

Mr. Jefferson, again in a letter to Governor Plumer, stated his recognition of the necessity of reducing public indebtedness. Mr. Jefferson did not always agree with Alexander Hamilton's solutions and methods, to be sure. But they were certainly in agreement as to the necessity of eliminating the poison of mounting public debt.

To Governor Plumer, Jefferson wrote: "We see in England the consequences of the want of economy; their laborers reduced to live on a penny in the shilling of their earnings, to give up bread, and resort to oatmeal and potatoes for food; and their landholders exiling themselves to live in penury and obscurity abroad, because at home the government must have all the clear profits of their land."

That sounds like a pretty fair description of what is going to happen to us. Our own Government continues to increase its share of the Nation's "profits"—the savings and investment—which it must absorb in order to finance the massive spending increases we have programmed into our laws. Indeed, the burden of paying for that irresponsibility falls ultimately on the taxpayers, our taxpayers, our citizens, and cuts into the share of their own pay, which they would otherwise be able to use to provide for themselves.

I fully recognize there are many Senators here on both sides of the aisle who are equally committed to confronting and resolving these woes resulting from our debt. There are sincere disagreements as to how to accomplish that goal. I do believe there is now widespread recognition that the goal must be met.

I, therefore, close by reiterating my belief that we must not give up on this process. We must not give up on coming to agreement merely because of the disagreements which have divided us to this point. I do not find any reason to "give up" to be a convincing one. Give up because we believe we might hold political advantage if the impasse persists, or because we cannot agree on